

Owen J. Gamon
Registered Patent Attorney
216 18th Ave North
South Saint Paul, MN 55075
voice: 651-645-7135
fax: 651-457-5622

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 01 2006

Fax

To: Commissioner for Patents
Examiner: Nelson C. Lam
Group Art Unit: 2825
Serial No: 10/728,289
First Named Inventor: Robert F. Lembach
Filed: December 4, 2003
Confirmation Number: 7019
Title: Positioning of Inverting Buffers in a Netlist
Attorney Docket: ROC920030229US1

From: Owen J. Gamon

Fax: 571-273-8300	Pages: 3
Phone: 571-272-8318	Date: May 1, 2006
Re: 10/728,289	CC:

☐ **Urgent** ☐ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ☐ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

● **Comments:**

Attached is a form PTOL-413A.

This fax contains privileged, confidential, and attorney work product information. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy this information and notify the sender.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 01 2006

PTOL-413A (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0851-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/728,289 First Named Applicant: Robert F. Lembach
Examiner: Nelson C. Lam Art Unit: 2825 Status of Application: Rejected

Tentative Participants:

(1) Owen J. Gamon

(2) Nelson C. Lam

(3) _____

(4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 5/3/2006

Proposed Time: 2:00 (PM) EDT

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal(3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit to Be Shown or Demonstrated ☐ YES ☒ No

If yes, provide brief description:

Issues to Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
1) 102, 103	1, 7, 11, 17	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) 112	1, 7, 15	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3)	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: See attached continuation sheet.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Owen J. Gamon

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

36,143

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual use. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THE ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Serial No: 10/728,289
Docket: ROC920030229US1

Agenda

1. 35 USC 102 and 103: Why are claims 1-6 allowable but claims 7-20 rejected since all the elements of claim 1 are also included in independent claims 7, 11, and 17? That is, "moving an inverting buffer from a source to a sink in a netlist if the source is to send both inverting and non-inverting signals from the source to the sink," which is allowable in claim 1 is also present in rejected claims 7, 11, and 17.

2. Claims 1-10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because "in claim 1, where is the origin of the inverting and non-inverting signal."

Claim 1 recites "the source is to send both inverting and non-inverting signals from the source to the sink." Thus, the origin of the inverting and non-inverting signals is the source.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because "it is unclear how the inverting and non-inverting signals relate to the rest of the claim."

The source (referenced in the "means for finding" and the "means for removing" in claim 7) sends the inverting and non-inverting signals, so the inverting and non-inverting signals are related to the "means for finding" and the "means for removing."

The "means for adding" in claim 7 recites that the inverting signals are sent on the first route that connects the source to the sink, and the non-inverting signals are sent on the second route from the source to the sink, so the inverting and non-inverting signals are related to the "means for adding."

Thus, the inverting and non-inverting signals relate to all elements in claim 7.

4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because "the specification does not clarify how the source and sink are in a chip without floorplans."

Why are the sections of the specification recited in the previously-filed amendment insufficient?

For example, Figures 2A and 2B illustrate a floorplanned chip while, in contrast, Figures 3A and 3B illustrate a chip without floorplans, which is further supported by page 14, lines 9-10, page 14, line 22 through page 16, line 21, page 16, lines 22-23, and page 17, line 5 through page 20, line 1.